

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10005922-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Fu-Tai SHIH

Confirmation No.: 6695

Application No.: 09/780,308

Examiner: Djename M. BAYARD

Filing Date: 02-09-2001

Group Art Unit: 2141

Title: COMPUTER SEARCHES WITH RESULTS PRIORITIZED USING HISTORIES RESTRICTED
BY QUERY CONTEXT AND USER COMMUNITY

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2004

Technology Center 2100

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:

- (X) Response/Amendment (X) Petition to extend time to respond
() New fee as calculated below () Supplemental Declaration
() No additional fee
() Other: (fee \$)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$18	\$ 0
INDEP. CLAIMS		MINUS		= 0	X \$88	\$ 0
[] FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ \$300	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	1ST MONTH \$110.00	2ND MONTH \$430.00	3RD MONTH \$980.00	4TH MONTH \$1530.00		\$ 110
OTHER FEES						\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 110

Check for \$110 enclosed.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Fu-Tai SHIH

By Clifton L. Anderson

Clifton L. Anderson

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 30,989

Date of Deposit: 10-15-2004

Typed Name: Clifton L. Anderson

Signature: Clifton L. Anderson

Date: 10-15-2004



09/780,308 (Shih) 10005922-1 H0010Ama PATENT

2141
41 / \$

In The United States Patent and Trademark Office

For: COMPUTER SEARCHES WITH RESULTS PRIORITIZED USING HISTORIES RESTRICTED BY QUERY CONTEXT AND USER COMMUNITY			
Applicant: Fu-Tai SHIH		Attorney Docket No.: 10005922-1	
Serial No.: 09/780,308 (6695)	Filed: February 9, 2001	Art Unit: 2141	Examiner: Djenane M. BAYARD

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2004

Response A

Technology Center 2100

Sir:

[01] This is a response to the Office Action mailed July 14, 2001. All outstanding rejections are traversed as detailed below. No amendments are presented. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

[02] The Office Action rejects Claims 1 and 5 based on a combination of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0103167 to Grooters et al., "Grooters" herein, U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046361 to Kirsch et al., "Kirsch" herein, and U.S. Patent No. 6,389,460 to Stewart et al. "Stewart" herein. The Office Action refers to "Ferguson" in a couple of places; herein it is assumed that "Ferguson" means "Stewart". If there is actually a distinct "Ferguson" reference, please identify it by patent number.

[03] The present invention improves upon prior art in which a request processor receives incomplete HTTP requests pending their completion and then processes the completed requests. Such systems are vulnerable to denial-of-service attacks as legitimate requests can be rejected while the request processor waits for bogus incomplete requests to be completed. The present invention withholds incomplete HTTP requests. The invention provides for passing once-incomplete HTTP requests to the request processor once they have been completed. However, incomplete HTTP requests can be retired instead of being passed on if they are not completed in a timely manner, as determined by the storage limitations, e.g., queue depth.

[04] The Office Action cites Grooters (Page 5, paragraph 39) for teaching “an admissions control system for a host site comprising a trap that withholds from a request processor incomplete HTTP requests”. The cited paragraph actually reads:

[05] [0039] An error control system module 436 may log all errors and communications problems which occur during the course of processing messages. This module preferably traps errors which occur so that they are not displayed over any currently executing application. Preferably, a user may select to display the error messages on the user interface if desired.

[06] In this paragraph, there is no reference to an admissions control system, no reference to a host site, no reference to a request processor, and no reference to requests, HTTP or otherwise, incomplete or otherwise. Paragraph 39 does refer to a “trap” but it traps errors “so that they are not displayed over any executing application”. An incomplete HTTP request is not an error, it is a normal packet of information, so there is nothing in Grooters that remotely suggests trapping incomplete HTTP requests.

[07] The Office Action concedes that Grooters “fails to teach wherein the request is http request”. However, even this apparently assumes Grooters teaches trapping requests, which it does not.

[08] The Office Action further concedes that Grooters fails to teach “retiring incomplete HTP requests to avoid exceeding a storage limitation. The Office Action then asserts that Kirsch teaches retiring incomplete http requests. The pertinent paragraph of Kirsch reads:

[09] [0062] A preferred method 40 of processing redirection URLs provided to a server computer system 16 by a client computer system 12 is illustrated in FIG. 3. As each client request is received 42 the data provided as part of the request is examined to determine whether the request embeds the redirect key word 44. If the URL data does not specify a redirection request consistent with the present invention, the URL data is checked 46 to determine whether the URL data conventionally specifies an existent local web page. If the web page does not exist or, based on the client identification data provided via the HTTP protocol in connection with the URL client request, the particular client is not permitted access to the existent web page, the HTTPd server 30 determines a corresponding error message 48 that is returned to the client computer system 12. Otherwise, the HTTPd server 30 proceeds and serves the local web page 50 to the client computer system 12.

[10] Paragraph 62 does refer to HTTP and it may be fair to assume that the mentioned “client” request is an HTTP request. However, there is no mention of incomplete requests, HTTP or otherwise. Kirsch does differentiate requests that specify a redirection key word and those that do not, but both are complete requests. The requests that do not specify a redirection key word may refer to an accessible site or not, but in either case the request is complete. There is also no teaching concerning either withholding or retiring requests, incomplete or otherwise. Kirsch only deals with requests that are processed, although the processing may result in an error message rather than a requested web page. Thus, the Office Action is in error in asserting that Kirsch discloses trapping incomplete HTTP request or even anything concerning incomplete HTTP requests.

[11] As asserted by the Office Action, Stewart discloses a method in which certain stored objects are cleaning outdated images from image storage to meet storage limitations. However, the objects being managed are images and not incomplete HTTP requests. As there is no suggestion in Grooters or Kirsch regarding storage, storage limitations, or retiring any objects, let alone incomplete HTTP requests, there is no motivation to combine Stewart with these other references as proposed in the Office Action. Accordingly, the obviousness rejections of Claims 1 and 5 should be withdrawn.

[12] Regarding dependent Claims 2 and 6, the Office Action asserts that Grooters teaches a trap sending requests to a deferral manager, citing paragraph 39, quoted above. However, this paragraph does not mention a deferral manager at all. The Office Action goes on to assert that Grooters teaches sending complete HTTP requests to the deferral manager and responding to some complete HTTP requests with deferral messages. However, there is no such teaching in Grooters.

[13] The Office Action further asserts that Kirsch discloses a deferral manager that sends some complete HTTP requests to a request processor and responding to some HTTP complete requests with deferral managers, citing paragraph 62, quoted above. However, Kirsch does not disclose responding to complete HTTP requests with deferral messages. The messages mentioned by Kirsch indicate that a requested web site does not exist or that the client is not permitted to view the requested web site. In contrast, a deferral message is to the effect that the current web site is busy but should be available to the client at a later time. Accordingly, the finding of the additional limitations of Claims 2 and 6 in the cited references are without foundation and the associated grounds of rejection should be withdrawn.

[14] CONCLUSION

[15] The present invention relates to incomplete HTTP requests, which are not even dealt with by any of the cited references. The further limitations regarding how they are dealt with and how complete requests can be deferred are not addressed in any of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application in its current form.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Clifton L. Anderson".

Clifton L. Anderson
Reg. No. 30,989
(408) 245-0820